

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 22 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 4, 7 to 11, 14 to 18, 21 and 22 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, and 20 stand rejected as obvious.

Prior to considering the rejections, Applicant notes that the Examiner gave no indication as to the status of the drawings in the "Office Action Summary" of Paper No. 4. Accordingly, Applicant does not know whether the Examiner considered the drawings.

Enclosed is a copy of the filing receipt in the above application and a copy of a return receipt postcard dated stamped May 7, 2002 by the USPTO. The filing receipt shows that Applicant claimed priority on a foreign application in the filed declaration. The return receipt postcard shows that the USPTO received the priority document submitted by Applicant.

The Examiner failed to acknowledge the foreign priority claim and receipt of the certified copy on the "Office Action Summary." If the failure to note the priority claim was an oversight, Applicant respectfully requests that the priority claim be acknowledged. If there is a problem with the priority claim, Applicant respectfully submits that the problem should have been noted in Paper No. 4.

Applicant(s) have amended the description to correct a grammatical error.

Claims 1, 15, and 22 are amended to include features inherent in the original claim. Accordingly, these amendments only clarify the invention and do not require consideration of new issues or a new search.

Claim 8 is amended to provide a consistent recitation of the same element throughout the claim. This corrects informality in view of the fact that the Examiner did not reject the claim for §112 issues.

Claim 14 is amended to correct antecedent basis informalities in view of the fact that the Examiner did not reject the claim for §112 issues.

Claims 1 to 4, 7 to 11, 14 to 18, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,937,163, hereinafter Lee.

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. Applicant first recites, in Claim 1, "A computer-based method of interactively generating an index page." Thus, the method is directed at generating an index page and not using a table of contents or a tab for information retrieval. Moreover, Lee teaches how the pages are formed. Specifically,

The filing icon 128 may be selected to control into which one of multiple URL/HTML link organizations (each URL/HTML link organization is associated with one of the book icons 121-125) retrieved information is to be associated and organized.

Lee, Col. 12, lines 16-20.

Thus, a filing icon is used to associate each URL/HTML link with a book icon. Also,

If new URLs and/or HTML link information is retrieved, then the processor 51 adds entries to the Table of Contents corresponding to such information. Entries are added in a hierarchical fashion and associated with the URL or HTML link that was executed to retrieve such new URLs or HTML links. This is illustrated in FIG. 11.

Lee, Col. 16, lines 35 to 40. (Emphasis added.)

Thus, Lee taught that it was a processor that added entries in a hierarchical fashion to the Table of Contents.

This teaches away from Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1.

Also, Claim 1 recites:

displaying a window including a list of index page types;  
displaying a window including a list of index line types [for one index page type] upon selection of said one index page type in said list of index page types;  
displaying a token string including a plurality of tokens for one index line type, upon selection of said one index line type in said list of index line types, wherein said plurality of tokens includes only tokens appropriate for said one index line type . . .

(Emphasis added)

Thus, Claim 1 defines a relationship between the index page type and the index line type, and between the index line type and the token string. The Examiner's rejection demonstrates that Lee fails to teach Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner cited Lee, Col. 11, lines 53 to 67 as teaching "displaying a token string including a plurality of tokens for one index line type, upon selection of said one index line type in said list of index line types."

Lee stated at Col. 11, lines 63 to 66:

When a book icon 121-125 is selected, a book image 110 is displayed, in which the URLs and HTMLs recorded for that topic are displayed, as described below.

The book icon is the highest level of organization taught by Lee and not the lowest as interpreted by the Examiner. The other features cited by the Examiner in the rejection are included within the book image 110 as illustrated in Fig. 10 of Lee. Thus, the book icons are not a token string for one index line type, but are specific URL/HTML links recorded for a topic as described by Lee. Accordingly, as stated, the Examiner's

rejection shows that Lee fails to teach Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 4, and 7 depend from Claim 1 and so distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, which are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claims 2 to 4, and 7.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 8, Claim 8 recites "an insert index page dialogue window." As quoted above, Fig 10 of Lee is a book image displayed when a book icon is selected. The book image is a display of "the URLS and HTMLS recorded for the topic." This has nothing to do with a graphic user interface that includes "an insert index page dialogue window." In addition, the above comments concerning Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 8.

Claims 9 to 11, and 14 depend from Claim 8 and so distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 8, which are incorporated herein by reference.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claims 9 to 11 and 14.

With respect to Claim 15, the language discussed above with respect to Claim 1 is included in Claim 15. Therefore, the comments with respect to Claim 1, which are incorporated herein by reference, are directly applicable to Claim 15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 15.

Claims 16 to 18, and 21 depend from Claim 15 and so distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 15, which are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and

withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claims 16 to 18 and 21.

With respect to Claim 22, the language discussed above with respect to Claim 1 is included in Claim 22. Therefore, the comments with respect to Claim 1, which are incorporated herein by reference, are directly applicable to Claim 22. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 22.

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5, 937,163 (Lee) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,623679, hereinafter Rivette.

Assuming that the combination of references is appropriate and the characterization of Rivette is correct, the information relied upon by the Examiner from the secondary reference fails to address the shortcomings of the primary reference and noted above for Claims 1, 8, and 15. Therefore, each of Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19 and 20 distinguishes over the combination of references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, and 20.

Claims 1 to 22 remain in the application. Claims 1, 8, 14, 15, and 22 have been amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant.


CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 12, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880



August 12, 2003  
Date of Signature